

## OPINION 580

DETERMINATION OF AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE PARTS OF  
THE *HISTOIRE NATURELLE DES POISSONS* BY CUVIER &  
VALENCIENNES, 1828-1850

**RULING.**—(1) The new names included in Volumes 2 to 22 of the editions known respectively as the "Regular Edition" and the "Strasbourg de luxe Edition" of the work entitled *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* written partly by Cuvier (G.L.C.F.D.) and partly by Valenciennes (A.), and published 1828-1850 are to be attributed to Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, or, as the case may be, to Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes according to the particulars set out in paragraph (3) of the present Ruling, save as regards certain names attached to descriptions which are clearly marked as having been written by some other author.

(2) The title of the under-mentioned work is hereby placed on the Official List of Works approved as available for use in Zoological Nomenclature with the Title No. 40 :—

Cuvier (G.L.C.F.D.) & Valenciennes (A.), 1828-1850, *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* (Paris)

(3) The authorship and dates of publication of the various parts of the above work are to be cited according to the particulars set out in Tables I and II.

TABLE I  
*Authorship*

Volume	Regular Edition	Strasbourg de luxe Edition	Author
2	1-238 (line 13)	1-177 (line 11)	Cuvier
	238 (line 14)-249 (line 10)	177 (line 12)-185 (line 20)	Valenciennes
	249 (line 11)-262 (line 4)	185 (line 21)-195 (line 3)	Cuvier
	262 (line 5)-386	195 (line 4)-290	Valenciennes
	387 -490	291 -371	Cuvier
6	1 -425	1 -320	Valenciennes
	426 -491	321 -369	Cuvier
	492 blank	370 blank	
	493 -559	371 -420	Valenciennes
7	1- -440	1 -330	Cuvier
	441 -531	331 -379	Valenciennes
8	1 -470	1 -346	Cuvier
	471 -509	347 -375	Valenciennes
9	1 -198	1 -147	Cuvier
	199 -329	148 -244 (line 19)	Valenciennes
	330 -359 (line 3)	244 (line 20)-266 (line 5)	Cuvier
	359 (line 4) -371	266 (line 6) -275	Valenciennes
	372 -427	276 -316	Cuvier
	428 blank		
	429 -512	317 -379	Valenciennes

Volumes 1, 3, 4 and 5 are by Cuvier; volumes 10-22 by Valenciennes.

TABLE II  
*Dates of Publication*

*Octavo issue*

Volume	Date (from title page)	Date of Publication*
1 and 2	1828	Oct. 1828
3	1829	Apr. 1829
4	1829	Nov. 1829
5	1830	July 1830
6	1830	Sept. 1830
7	1831	Apr. 1831
8	1831	Jan. 1832
9	1833	Mar. 1833
10	1835	Sept. 1835
11	1836	July 1836
12	1837	Mar. 1837
13	1839	Apr. 1839
14	1839	Jan. 1840
15	1840	Nov. 1840
16	1842	Aug. 1842
17	1844	July 1844
18	1846	Aug. (or Sept.) 1846
19	1846	May 1847
20	1847	Nov. 1847
21	1848	Sept. 1848
22	1849	Jan. 1850 ( <i>i.e.</i> end of 1849)

\* From Sherborn (1925, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (9) 15 : 600).

#### HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1228)

On 24 May 1957, Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor Michigan, U.S.A.) addressed a preliminary application to the Office of the Commission on the question of the authorship and date to be attributed to the various parts of Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Histoire naturelle des Poissons*, 1828–1850. Dr. Bailey's definitive application was sent to the printer on 2 July 1957 and was published on 30 December 1957 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 13(10/11) : 309–312.

The following comments were received :—

*Dr. Denys W. Tucker* (British Museum (Natural History) London).—  
 “I am writing to oppose the application by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey for a ruling determining the authorship of the various portions of Cuvier & Valenciennes' *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* (1828–1850).

The sole acceptable reason for the addition of an author's name to a taxon is to specify thereby the definition understood and to indicate the reference in which that definition is contained. Other reasons, notably personal credit,

have operated but almost always to the acute disadvantage of taxonomy and we may all look forward to an ideal age in which taxonomy will have become stabilised and the addition of authors' names, with its undesirable consequences, will have become unnecessary.

Meanwhile, a citation *Alpha beta* C.V. has, for more than a century, sufficed to indicate to ichthyologists that the original description is contained in one well-known work. Whatever the historical justification for Dr. Bailey's suggestion, the replacement of the time-honoured C.V. citation by the appropriate Cuvier or Valenciennes citation will mean that the workers of the future will have to contend, not only with the discrepancies between pre-ruling and post-ruling literature; they will also have to search through works of the cited author and even the discovery that a name is contained in the *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* will not always absolve them from responsibility for searching earlier works of the author in question. Thus will practical ichthyology become further encumbered and subordinated to historical, bibliographic and nomenclatorial pedantry."

Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (British Museum (Natural History), London).—"Dr. Bailey's proposal is in accordance with the Paris decision recorded in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 565-566, Concl. 49(1)(a), and would need no special ruling of the Commission other than confirmatory, but :

(a) I propose that, on the contrary, the Commission should be asked to rule that names proposed by either Cuvier or Valenciennes in *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons*, a 22-volume work published under their joint names, should constitute an exception to the Recommendation.

My reasons are :

1. The work is a great classic of ichthyology and the only work published jointly by these authors.

2. The purpose of citing an author's (or authors') name(s) is to give a reference, not credit.

3. The names 'Cuvier & Valenciennes' or their abbreviation 'C. & V.' or 'C.V.' constitute a reference in themselves to which it is only necessary to add volume and page.

4. The double attribution has a century-long tradition behind it.

I would submit further that in accordance with the Recommendation attached to Article 22 'Cuvier & Valenciennes' qualify for the time-honoured abbreviation 'C.V.' or 'C. & V.'.

I agree with Dr. Bailey (his paragraph 3) that it is not good practice to copy authority at second hand, without going to the original source, but this objection, carried to its logical conclusion, would be an argument for not using an author's name unless the original description has been checked. It is equally uncritical to obtain the exact authorship from Dr. Bailey's table.

If an author is not in a position to check the original sources, or is not justified by the nature of his work in giving the time to it, the citation of the author's name may still mean something. It means 'the species currently understood as that to which the name was first validly given' the author's name being the clue to that first valid proposal. It is still the reference, not the author, that is important.

(b) If, however, Dr. Bailey's proposal finds favour, I suggest that the Commission be asked to sanction the abbreviation 'Cuv. in C. & V.' and 'Val. in C. & V.'

Dr. A. F. Brunn (Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen).—"I would like to support Dr. Bailey's suggestion in all respects."

I. Ginsburg, R. H. Kanazawa, E. A. Lachner, L. P. Schultz, and W. R. Taylor (U.S. National Museum) and G. W. Mead (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).—"For the reasons presented below, the undersigned ichthyologists recommend that the Commission deny Dr. Bailey's request as published on page 310, paragraphs 4(1) and 4(2) of the proposal cited above.

1. Few, rather than many, authors have adopted the practice of attributing species in accordance with the authorship of the various parts of Cuvier and Valenciennes's work since the publication of a synopsis of the authorship of these parts by Bailey (*Copeia*, 1951, no. 3, pp. 249-251). Prior to 1951, the new names proposed in this work were usually ascribed to both authors. That practice, in general use for over a hundred years, has created no confusion, and the restricted usage proposed by Dr. Bailey would serve only to increase the work of ichthyologists who cite the names proposed in these volumes.

2. Should the Commission rule in favour of Dr. Bailey's request, a precedent would be set for similar requests to establish single authorship for the new names proposed in other co-authored works that grade imperceptibly from those for which the authorship is easily ascertained (e.g. Cuvier and Valenciennes) to those for which the individual authorship can be determined only with great difficulty. To whom should be credited the new names proposed in Meek and Hildebrand's 'The Marine Fishes of Panama' (*Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Publ. Zool. Ser. Vol. 15*, pts. 1-3, 1923-28) which was written by Hildebrand after Meek's death?

Most American ichthyologists know that H. W. Fowler wrote the manuscripts for volumes 7, 8, and 10 (*U.S. nat. Mus. Bull. 100*, Contributions to the biology of the Philippine Archipelago and adjacent regions 1928-30) but which were published as co-authored works by Fowler and Bean. Are the new names in those three volumes to be attributed to Fowler now or should we wait until an historical account of that project is published and another appeal made to the Commission? There are other similar instances.

3. Each title-page of the 22-volume *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* states that the work is to be considered co-authored. The author (or authors) of a volume or of a new name is in a better position to indicate how the volume or name should be cited than anyone else. A confirmation of this intent was expressed by Valenciennes, *Ichthyologie des Iles Canaries*, vol. 2, pt. 2, (in Webb and Berthelot, *Hist. Nat. des Iles Canaries*, 1835-50) for here we find species described in the *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* attributed to Cuvier and Valenciennes by Valenciennes; species which Dr. Bailey now proposes to attribute to one or the other of these authors but not to both. (For example, on page 26 of the *Ichthyologie des Iles Canaries* Valenciennes begins a description with 'Pristipoma viridense. Nob. (2)', with the footnote: '(2) Cuv., Val., Hist. Nat. des Poiss., V. pag. 287', a volume of this latter work which was drafted wholly by Cuvier). Therefore the intent of these authors is clear. Shall we

violate this intent for no useful purpose ?

We conclude that Dr. Bailey's proposal will contribute nothing to taxonomic stability or to the usefulness of Cuvier and Valenciennes's work, hence this recommendation that the Commission deny that application."

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 7 July 1958 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (58)16 either for or against the proposals set out in points (1) and (2) on *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 13 : 310 paragraph 4 as modified by Miss Trewavas's compromise proposal.

At the close of the Voting Period on 7 October 1958 the state of the voting was as follows :—

(a) Affirmative votes—nineteen (19), received in the following order : Holthuis, Boschma, Bodenheimer, Hemming, Vokes, Riley, Hankó, Hering, Mayr, Lemche, Mertens, Jaczewski, Brinck, Dymond, do Amaral, Stoll, Cabrera, Kühnelt, Bonnet.

(b) Negative votes—two (2) : Prantl, Tortonese.

(c) On leave of absence—three (3) : Bradley, Key, Miller.

(d) Votes not returned—none.

In returning his Voting Paper, Dr. L. B. Holthuis commented : " In my opinion, authors should be free to use either ' Cuvier ' or ' Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes ' as the author's name." Dr. Ernst Mayr cast his vote conditionally, asking that it be counted with the majority.

#### CERTIFICATE

WE certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (58)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal set out in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the Ruling given in the present Opinion No. 580.

N. D. RILEY

*Secretary*

RICHARD V. MELVILLE

*Assistant Secretary*

*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

*London*

*1 May 1959.*